

and with our allies and others have suffered greatly as a result of the decision to attack Iraq based on an apparently false claim that it possessed weapons of mass destruction.

As a result, even the administration has been forced to back off just a bit from some of the bolder claims it made before the start of the war in Iraq.

In a much discussed memo released late last year, Secretary Rumsfeld wondered whether we were winning or losing the war on terror:

Are we capturing, killing or deterring and dissuading more terrorists every day than the madrassas and the radical clerics are recruiting, training and deploying against us?

At a minimum, the administration's missteps in Iraq have greatly complicated the answer to this question, and attacking Iraq, at least in the short to medium term, may have made Americans less secure, not more, against terrorist threat.

The American people need to know whether attacking Iraq has helped our efforts against al-Qaida and made them more secure.

These are the critical questions currently confronting this administration.

Unfortunately, while the administration has chosen to make its accomplishments in the war on terror a centerpiece of its re-election campaign, it has resisted telling the American people precisely what it did and did not do to win this war.

It has resisted allowing the 9/11 Commission access to the policymakers and documents that can provide some answers.

It has refused to provide the families of the victims of September 11 and the American people with the information they deserve so they can judge for themselves the administration's record.

Rather than attacking those who raise questions about the administration's policies, President Bush and senior administration officials should do all they can to clear up these troubling questions.

The first step is to make themselves and any supporting documents immediately available to the 9/11 Commission, which is running up against a deadline for its important work of ensuring the American people that we do everything possible to prevent another September 11.

This includes having National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice testify publicly. It also includes having the President and Vice President appear privately before the full commission for as long as needed to clear up these critical issues.

America's soldiers have performed heroically in the defense of their Nation. All America stands united in our pride and gratitude for their service.

In order to be certain our Government has done and is doing all it can to defend us, Americans have a right to know more about our Government's priorities and actions in the months leading up to the attacks of September 11.

Americans have placed the security of this Nation in the hands of this administration.

That trust is a privilege, and alongside it comes the obligation to answer the questions and concerns of the American people.

To continue to refuse the 9/11 Commission's requests and to criticize those who raise legitimate questions about its actions merely adds to the doubt felt by an increasing number of Americans.

It is time for the administration to honor our citizens' right to know.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have three who wish to speak in morning business on our side: Senator STABENOW, Senator CORZINE, and Senator CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that on our side they be allotted 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is permitted to allocate his time.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

MEDICARE SOLVENCY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to express tremendous concern about the latest news regarding the Medicare trust fund and the solvency of the trust fund. We are now hearing that Medicare, in fact, will become insolvent 7 years sooner than we had been told last year.

During the time between last year and this year, there has been a Medicare bill passed by the Senate. I believe there is a direct correlation between what was passed, which I have deep concerns about, and the new number we are hearing about Medicare being jeopardized and becoming insolvent 7 years sooner.

We know that in the bill that was passed last year, there were payments for the first time to private plans so they could compete with traditional Medicare. We know that, according to the Congressional Budget Office, it in fact has cost 13.2 percent more for the private sector through Medicare+Choice to provide the very same services as traditional Medicare. Rather than saying we should go, then, with the most cost-effective way to provide health care services for seniors and use traditional Medicare, the response, unfortunately, from the Congress and the President was to subsidize private insurance companies and HMOs so they could compete more favorably.

Originally, it was \$14 billion taken away from providing prescription drug coverage for seniors, helping to pay for their medicine, taking those dollars away from other preventive services that could be paid for, other direct services that could be given to our sen-

iors, and it was put into providing subsidies for the private sector.

Now we see in the new numbers how all of this has changed with the revelation of the tremendous increase in the cost of the Medicare bill which we were told after it passed. We are now told the first estimate of \$14 billion being diverted is now really \$46 billion being diverted—\$46 billion not going to pay for our seniors receiving help with their medicine, to afford their medicine through Medicare, but being diverted to essentially privatize or help private plans be able to compete because it costs more to provide Medicare coverage and prescription drug coverage under private plans. We see greater costs there.

Then right at the time we need to be doing everything possible to leverage and lower our costs, we know this Medicare prescription drug bill actually says in the middle of the bill that Medicare is not allowed to group purchase, to get bulk discounts, which is astounding. Every time I say that to a group of people at home in Michigan, they look at me in bewilderment: What in the world were you thinking that you would not try to get the best possible price through a bulk discount? Yet we know that one of the reasons there is increased costs in this bill is because they are not doing bulk purchasing.

Why are they not doing bulk purchasing? Because the pharmaceutical industry does not want that to be done. They do not want us to get lower prices. They want us to pay the highest possible prices. So, unfortunately, this bill says that, which is another reason why I opposed the passage of the Medicare bill.

Over and over we are seeing situations unravel that cause me great concern, not only about the new dollar amount, the new substance in this bill, but also about the process that brought us to the passage of the Medicare bill. I will speak now to some of what we have been hearing and reading in recent days and weeks.

The Government's top expert on Medicare costs was warned he would be fired if he told key lawmakers about a series of Bush administration cost estimates that could have torpedoed congressional passage of the White House-backed Medicare prescription drug plan. This was written on March 12 of this year, just last week, in the Miami Herald. We know there were new estimates, new actual costs that were identified, and we were not told about them before the passage of this bill.

We know that between November 20 and 24 of last year, administration officials repeatedly stated without qualification that the prescription drug bill "will not cost more than \$400 billion over 10 years." In making these representations, administration officials relied on CBO estimates without citing the conflicting estimates from their own analysts. This comes from a special report Health and Human Services